

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,983	03/26/2004	Yar-Ming Wang	GP-304670	9619
Kathryn A. Ma	7590 09/18/200	EXAMINER		
General Motor	rs Corporation	MAYEKAR, KISHOR		
Mail Code 482 PO Box 300	2-C23-B21	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Detroit, MI 48	265-3000	1795		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			00/10/2000	DADED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/810,983	WANG ET AL.					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Kishor Mayekar	1795					

	Kisnor Mayekar	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appen for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la</li> </ul>			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the control of th	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4.6-9.11-18 and 20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:

/Kishor Mayekar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

13. Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Hoffman discloses 'the range of amps which may be supplied is preferably about 1 amp per gallon of cleaning solution to about 20 amps per gallon of cleaning solution to allow 20 amps per gallon of cleaning solution from a power supply "that produces a low voltage direct current output from 5 to 350 DC amps". Col. 7, 1, 12-31. That there is an upper limit to the current and not as argued by Applicant to enormous amperage for a tank to hold 30,000 to 50,000 gallons. Hoffman further discloses in Example 1 a current of 80 to 95 amps for a surface area of 1800 pounds of shredded or whole used aluminum cans and in example 4 a 400-gallon tank of cleaning 40 used chrome plated grocery carts where the current can be calculated as less than 1 amp per gallon for a 400-gallon tank with the 5-350 DC amps current output (350 amps divided by 400 gallons). In the above examples the surface area of the materials to be treated is quite large. Jaki leaches metallic fines as solids removing from a surface by electrocleaning in alface electrocleaners. Jaki also teaches that current densities with values below the recommended values produce light to marginal electrocleaning. Pola teaches the electrocleaning of a copper foll from a highly alkaline electrocleaners however with a current density of 0.1 to 50 amps per square decimeter, the current density value being lower the recommended current density of 5-8 amp per square decimeter from Zaki. As such the optimization holds in the rejection of claim 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11-17 and 20 as stated by the examiner in the last finding action. And further because of absence of proven the criticality of the recited range by Applicant. As to the rejections sof each of claims 3 and 18, the rejections stands for depending upon rejected claim 1.